Before the RECEIVED FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMUNIC

		M
OFFICE	OF SE	ONE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)	
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC., ET AL.)	CC Docket 97-90
,,,,,,,,,)	CCB/CPD 97-12
)	
Petition for Declaratory Ruling and Contingent)	
Petition for Preemption on Interconnection)	
Cost Surcharges)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF MCI

MCI Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI") hereby submits reply comments in response to parties' comments filed in the above-captioned proceeding on April 3, 1997.

In its Opposition, US WEST once again resorts to rhetoric, claiming that this petition represents "brazen" attempts of potential competitors to "expropriate the private property of incumbent local exchange carriers." US WEST Opposition at 1. Clearly, US WEST's Opposition does not demonstrate that its ICAM proceedings are in any way justified or consistent with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act"). Once again, it makes only vague assertions regarding the costs that it claims should be recovered through ICAM proceedings, and makes no attempt to demonstrate that any costs that are properly recoverable would not be recoverable in rates for unbundled elements based on TELRIC or in resale rates based on net voided costs.

Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996 Act), to be codified at 47 U.S.C. Sec.151 et.seq.

Although US WEST makes the assertion that the Commission's Order supports its attempt to recover "costs" through ICAM proceedings, its Opposition points to nothing to substantiate the assertion. The "random sampling" of language from the Order included in its Opposition is not, in fact, random -- the language was carefully chosen and then taken out of context. In fact, the language US WEST quotes merely reflects the Commission's determination that, if a CLEC requires access to unbundled network elements at quality that is higher than that the ILEC provides itself, the CLEC must pay for the incremental cost of providing the superior quality.

Notably, in "randomly sampling" the Order, US WEST ignores those portions of the Order that are directly relevant. In the Order, the Commission expressly determined that "under a TELRIC methodology, incumbent LECs' prices for interconnection shall recover the forward-looking costs directly attributable to the specified element, as well as a reasonable allocation of forward-looking common costs."

Order at ¶682. Thus, properly designed TELRIC-based rates will capture all properly allocable costs, and "provide[] for . . . a reasonable profit." Order at ¶699. Despite US WEST's rhetoric, nothing it points to suggests otherwise.^{2/2}

A number of commenters noted that all properly recoverable costs can and will be included in TELRIC-based rates. See, e.g., Comments of ACSI at 3 ("TELRIC-based prices should include all relevant costs of interconnecting with and making unbundled network elements available to new entrants"); Comments of Sprint at 4 ("the TELRIC rate standard adopted by the Commission affords ILECs the opportunity to recovery (sic) their just and reasonable costs of providing interconnection and unbundled network elements. It is simply not the case that U S West will be unable to recover its network upgrade costs absent adoption of its proposed ICAM surcharges."); Comments of the Association for Local Telecommunications Services ("ALTS") at 6 ("the forward-looking pricing principles demanded by Sections 251 and 252, and adopted by the Commission, (as well as several states which have addressed this issue) to govern pricing (continued...)

Ignoring this, US WEST suggests that, if it is not allowed to recover ICAM surcharges, it will have suffered an unconstitutional taking in violation of the Fifth Amendment. Thus, US WEST argues, because the Act may require it to build or improve some of its facilities so that local markets can be opened to competition, and because, it claims, the full cost of such improvements are not captured through TELRIC, it has been subject to a confiscatory taking. US WEST is wrong. All regulation imposes costs which may not be immediately and directly recoverable. That does not mean, of course, that all regulation imposes a taking. Thus, even if US WEST would not recapture each and every dollar it expends to comply with the Act, binding Supreme Court precedent dictates that no taking would occur unless US WEST as a whole was precluded from earning a reasonable profit. See Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope Natural Gas Co., 320 U.S. 591, 602 (1944).

In its Opposition. US WEST has not attempted to demonstrate that it can meet that test. Instead, it argues that the Act and the Commission's regulations should be analyzed under the constitutional standard for a "physical seizure of property" because the requirement that US WEST subject itself to competition is equivalent to the Government's seizure of the Youngstown Steel plant, Opposition at 8, and subjects US WEST to "forced servitude." Id. These arguments are as baseless as they sound. The Act does not require US WEST to physically relinquish its assets. It merely recognizes the advantages US WEST has accrued from being the monopoly provider of local phone

^{(...}continued) of interconnection agreements already conceptually encompass all costs that would be caused by CLECs...").

service in its region, and provides the means through which real competition can be

realized.

Dated: April 28, 1997

Although US WEST is unhappy with this, it cannot be allowed to use

tactics like the ICAM proceedings to thwart the Congressional goal of opening local

markets to competition. ELI's request that the Commission preempt these ICAM

proceedings should therefore be expeditiously granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy G! Zirkle

Lisa B. Smith

MCI Telecommunications

1801 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

-4-

STATEMENT OF VERIFICATION

I have read the foregoing and, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, there is good ground to support it, and it is not interposed for delay. I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on April 28, 1997

Amy G. Zirkle

MCI

1801 Pennsylvania Avenue Washington, DC 20006 (202) 887-3037

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mellanese Farrington, hereby certify that on this 28th day of April 1997, I served by first-class United States Mail, postage prepaid, a true copy of the foregoing Reply Comments, upon the following:

ITS 2100 M Street, N.W. Room 140 Washington, D.C. 20037

Regina Keeney*
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

James D. Schlichting*
Chief, Competitive Pricing
Division
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 518
Washington, D.C. 20554

Daniel M. Waggoner Richard L. Cys Davis Wright Tremaine, L.L.P. Suite 700 1155 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

J. Scott Bonney Vice President - Regulatory and External Affairs 155 108th Avenue, NE 8th Fl Bellevue, Washington 98004

Mitchell F. Brecher Robert E. Stup, Jr. Fleischman & Walsh, L.L.P. Suite 600 1400 16th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 Robert A. Mazer Albert Shuldiner Vinson & Elkins, L.L.P. 1455 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-1008

Riley M. Murphy Charles H.N. Kallenbach James C. Falvey American Communications Services, Inc. 131 National Business Parkway Suite 100 Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Danny E. Adams
John J. Heitmann
Kelley Drye & Warren L.L.P.
1200 19th Street
Suite 500
Washington. D.C. 20036

Richard J. Metzger General Counsel Association for Local Telecommunications Services 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 560 Washington, D.C.

David W. Carpenter David L. Lawson Sidley & Austin One First National Plaza Chicago, IL 60603 Douglas G. Bonner Mark Sievers Swidler & Berlin, Chartered 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20007

Gail L. Polivy GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036

R. Michael Senkowski Robert J. Butler Suzanne Yelen Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Cindy Z. Schonhaut, Sr. Vice President Julia Waysdorf, Senior Director Government Affairs ICG Telecom Group, Inc. 9605 East Maroon Circle Englewood, CO 80112

Albert H. Kramer
Jacob S. Farber
Dickstein, Shapiro Morin
& Oshinsky L.L.P.
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1526

Roy Lathrop*
Amy Zirkle*
MCI Telecommunications
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Lawrence W. Katz 1320 North Court House Road 8th Floor Arlington, VA 22201

William J. Balcerski 1095 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036

Peter Arth, Jr. Lionel B. Wilson Mary Mack Adu 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102

Genevieve Morelli
Executive Vice President
and General Counsel
Competitive Telecommunications Assoc.
1900 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert J. Aamoth Kelley Drye & Warren L.L.P. 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20036

Leon M. Kestenbaum Jay C. Keithley Norina T. Moy 1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 1000 Suite 1110 Washington, D.C. 20036 Charles C. Hunter
Catherine M. Hannan
Hunter Communications Law Group
1620 I Street, N.W.
Suite 701
Washington, D.C. 20006

Robert M. Lynch
Durward D. Dupre
Michael J. Zpevak
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center, Suite 3518
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Russell P. Rowe US West Law Department 1801 California Street Suite 5100 Denver, CO 80202

Timothy Berg Theresa Dwyer Two North Central Avenue Suite 2200 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2390 David N. Porter Vice President - Government Affairs WorldCom, Inc. 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 400 Washington, D.C.

Marlin D. Ard Randall E. Cape John W. Bogy 140 New Montgomery Street San Francisco, CA 94105

Robert B. McKenna Suite 700 1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

* Denotes Hand-delivery